ALL IN ONE.

fredit Mobilier, Salary Grab and De Golyer.

Sarfald Face to Face with His Constituents on All these Subjects.

is Great Speech at Warren, Ohio, September 19, 1874.

IGIAN CITIZENS-I have thought for sizier of years that we should soon reach state of years our political discussions is treate mainly to the past; where has larguage of some politicians of the he st should "let bygones be bygones," of the politics of our time would look man to the inture; but the presence presence as have transpired whin the past few days in one of our and lead me to fear we must again disas the questions connected with the war. high! I should prefer to discuss tha l atter questions of public policy. as is in my public speeches there has but little personal discussion. I presented to make my public life as im possible; but the course taken and citizens of this district justifies is ithink, in departing from the ordiname, and I shall discuss to night mainly succes of a somewhat personal characlathefirst place I recognize it as a min'y important element in our Amerolitics that the full blaze of public ment, investigation and inquiry coning all men who serve the public is a egard to our institutions. I do not in if sometimes the flerce light of ess burns rather than en-at perhaps is one of the necasso in the principle of the same in the principle of the same in lutic and for the same of the purpose missercised for any other purpose alia my other spirit, perhaps it is all is some for the man who so exercises it; all lare in that case a right to respond. like come here to-night to reply to a

ist I have to say on any one of these ins I invite any man, friend or enemy, parany question he chooses concern-

my hand which has led me to sthe first point what I did not intice until at a later stage of my In the year 1864 I argued a case act that I did so gave offense to a

with district. I refer to the case of statistics of the company of seven men, sought to gain the sex gainst the system of the town which the view of prolecting himself and the Facific the town which might be made; but it was a necessary to intimate to them that he might draw upon them for favors. Long before any proseur came uploading to men, the the seven did take it town years and the case came to the seven men, sought t ut shout that time there had i se officers in carrying into civil com-

by a civil court. Now, I believe that all over this land one of the great landmarks of civilization and civil liberty is the selirestraining power of the American people, curbing themselves and governing themselves by the limit of the civil law. I remind you of the fact that the Supreme Court unanimously sustained the position I took in that argument. There were some differences as to the reasoning by which the court reached the result, but the ruling of the court was unanimous that the trial had been unauthorized by law, and that the men must therefore be released. That did not release them, however, from the right of the Government to try them in the civil courts for the erimes with which they were charged. The note that I referred to as being banded to me Iwas that I should explain how it was that I, a Republican and Representative, gave my voice and whatever ability I poseesed as a lawyer, to save reebl conspirators from punishment. My answer was, "Hang them but hang them according to law, [applause;] if you hang them otherwise you commit murder." Now, if anyone has any question to ask on this subject I shall be glad to hear it.

[The speaker here paused, but there came from the audience no response to the request.]

There are three other things which I

There are three other things which I because to discuss; two of them may hardly be said to refer to my public career, ne of them directly to my official work. one of them directly to my official work The first one I shall refer to is my allege connection with

THE CREDIT MOBILIER.

There is a large number of people in the United States who use these words without any adequate idea of what they mean. have no doubt that a great many people feel about it very much as the fish-woman at Billingsgate market felt when Sidney Smith, the great humorist of England came along and began to talk with he She answered back in a very saucy way and he finally commenced to call he mathematical names; he called her a parallelogram, a hypothenuse, a parrilel edon, and other such terms, and edon, and other such terms, and she stood back, arghast and said she never heard such a nasty talking man in her life—never was a bused so before. Now people think they have said an enormous thing when they say that somebody had something to do with the Oredit Mobiller. I ask your attention just for a few moments to what that thing is, and in the next place to understand precisely what it is that I am supposed to have had to do with it. such terms, and sh

masserer their station and career. The masserer their station and career. The masser in their station and career. The masser in the state of the sta The Credit Mobilier was a corporation company was going to buy lands along the line of the Pacific Railroad at places where they thought cities and villages would grow up and to develop them, and he had no doubt that the growth of the

he had no doubt that the growth of the country would make that investment double itself in a very short time.

That was the alleged scheme that the Credit Mobilier Company had undertaken—a thing that if there is any gentleman in Warren who would feel any hesitancy in buying, it would be because he didn't believe up the growth of the country. in buying, it would be because he didn't believe in the growth of the country where the business was to be done. That stock was offered to me as a plain business proposition, with no intimation whatever that it was offered because the subscribers were members of Congress, for it was effered to many other people, and no better men lived than at least a large number of the gentlemen to whom it was offered. Some of them took it at once. Some men are cautious about making an investment; are cautious about making an investment; others are quick to determine. To none of those men was any explanation made that this Oredit Mobilier Company was in my way connected with ring of seven men who owned the principal portion of the stock and who had contracted with the directors of the Union Pacific road fo building six or seven hundred miles at an extravegant price, largely above what the work was worth. That was a secret held work was worth. This was a section only by those seven men who owned the principal portion of the stock. It is now understood that Mr. Oakes Ames, who was the center of the company of seven men, sought to gain the friendship of filteen or twenty

sold their votes for money or stock; that a man who having read thy review has they had accepted bribes. You remember that I was running for Congress in this district at that time. When that news rome I was away in the Rocky Mountains, I came home and the first day after my arrival. 'at Washington I authorized to be jublished a statement concerning what I knew about the Oakes Ames business. A great many people suppose now and say, and it has been repeated a hundred times in this district, and especially in this town fluring the last two weeks, that Mr. Gardield hedged and denied any knowledge of the Oredit Mobilier business, until finally the investigation brought it out. I repeat that imprediately on my arrival in Wash-I (Applause.) with that time there had been in they had accepted bribes. You remen turns a very considerable discussion that I was running for Congress in that I was running tor Congress in the Archive arbitrary conduct of some

sing affect in carrying into civil conantes the military jurisdiction and rule
late than they were warranted by the
late than they were had the late than thorized to be
late than they were warranted by the late than they on the
late than they war in the tranted the part of the stock and the first day after my arlate than they were warranted by the ball late than the late war in the
late than they were war in not a solder and
late than they were war in not a
late than they were late than they were late
late than they were war in not a
late than they were late than the late t

into any public affair has been held in the Last three years in Washington that I have not helped to organize and bring about.

[Applause.]

THE COMMITTER OF INVESTIGATION.

Now what was the investigation? You will remember that before the investigation shad gone far a feeling of alarm and excitement awept over the whole country that had hardly been paralleled in American history. Some men whose names were connected with the charges of the Credit Mobilier matter, shocked at the terrible charge of bribery throw at them, in the hurry of the moment so far forgot hemselves as to give equivocal answers as to whether they knew anything about it. The fact was that the unity was settling down to the belies at the whole thing was a mere caming siander and had no foundation is. Looking at the subject from distance, I am inclined to lieve that the impression left in the American mind is that the falls hose who were charged with buying k was not that they did anything on in reference to the stock, but that what I knew the thing was going the soft the newspapers. When the soft the newspapers. When the ities of investigation came to make ittee of investigation came to make itte

which I personally took exception, and only one. I understand that a gentleman ecupied this room a few nights ago who undertook to make the impression upon guilty of some improper relation with the Credit Mobilier. Let me read you a sentence or two from that report. The

committee says:

"Goncerning the members to whom he had sold or offered to sell the stock, the committee say that they 'do not find that Mr. Ames, in his negotiations with the persons above named, entered into any detail of the relations between the Credit Mobilier Company and Union Pacific Company, or gave them any specific in-formation as to the amount of dividends they would be likely to receive further than has been already stated, viz., that in some cases he had guaranteed a profit of ten per cent. They do not find as to the members of the present House

Oakes Ames had nothing to do with the Credit Mobilier till more than two years after that date.

The point on which I took exception to the report of the committee was this: The report held that Mr. Ames and Mr. Garfield diagree upon the purchase of the stock, and that Mr. Garfield received \$320 on account of it. I insisted that the evidence did not warrant that conclusion, and rose in my place in the House, and announced that I should make that statement good before the American public; that I hold myself responsible to demonstrate that the committee was wrong; that although they charged me with no wrong, they still had made a mistake of fact, which was against the sydence and an injustice to me. Soon after I published a phamplet of twenty-eight pages, in which I carefully and thoroughly reviewed all the testimony relating to me. I have now stood before the American people since the 8th day of May, 1873, announcing that the Io) owing propositions were proven concerning myself: That I never agreed even to take the stock of Mr. Ames: that I never received any dividends from it and was

Applause.]
Now the next thing I shall mention is question purely of official conduct—and that is a subject which has grown thread-bare in this community, and yet. I desire your attention to it for a few moments. I refer to

THE INCREASE OF OFFICIAL SALARIES, one year and a half ago. First, what ar the accusations concerning me?

There are several citizens in this tow who have signed their names to statements

In its legal sense.

Now take another step. I hold in my hand here a record of all the changes of pay that have been made since this government was founded, and in every case hand here a record of an arrival hand here a record of the content was founded, and in every case—I am not arguing now that it is right at all, I am only giving you a history of it—in every single instance when Congress has raised its pay it has raised it to take effect from the first day of the session of the Congress. Six times Congress has increased its own pay, and every time it made the pay retroactive. I say again, I am not arguing that this was right and proper; I am only arguing that it was lawful and constitutional to do it. In 1856 the pay was raised, and was made retroactive, for a year and four months, and the member of Congress from this district threw the casting vote that made it a law. That act raised the pay by a larger per cent than the act of the last Congress. Joehua R. Giddings was the one hundredth man that voted aye. Ninety-nine voted no. Joshua R. Giddings' vote the other way would have turned the score against it. That vote gave back pay for a year and four months. That vote gave Congress nine months' back pay for a time when members would not have been entitled to anything whatever, because under the old law they were paid only during the session. What did this district de? Did it call him a thief and a robber? A few

some cases he had guaranteed a profit of ten per cent. * * They do not find as to the members of the present House above named that they were aware of the object of Mr. Ames, or that they had any to the profitable investment. * * " They have not been able to find that any if of these members of Congress have been affected in their official action in econsequence of interest in the Uredit Mobilier stock. * " They do not find that either of the above-named gentlement in contracting with Mr. Ames had any. Nor did seither of them suppose himself, or was aware Mr. Ames had any. Nor did seither of them suppose how as guilty of any impropriety or even indelicacy in bedoming a purchaser of this stock. And finally, that the committee find nothing in the conduct or motives of either of these members of Congress to whom he offered the stock, and says that eleven of these members of Congress to whom he offered the stock, and says that eleven of the says: "He (Garfield) did not pay for it or receive it. * " He never paid any some yon that stock nor received money on account of it." Let me add that the last grant to the Union Pacific Railroad was by the act of July, 1864, and that Oakes Ames had nothing to do with the last grant to the Union Pacific Railroad was by the act of July, 1864, and that Oakes Ames had nothing to do with the Oredit Mobilier till more than two years after that date.

The point on which I took exception to "The point on which I took exception to "Other I and the profit and recent profits of the Committee of the form the profits of the condend of the condend of the profits of the condend of of the the Committee of Conference. The conference report between the two Houses was made in favor of the bill. Mr. Sherman brought in the report, saying when he brought it in that he had been opposed to the increase of pay, but the Senate had overruled him. He voted for the conference report, voted for the final passage of the bill. That bill gave back pay for a year and five months. Was John Sherman denounced as a thief and robber for that? Was Benjamin F. Wade called a thief and robber?

was Benjamin r. Wade called a thier and robber?

At that time I was not chairman of the committee, and had no other responsibility than that of an individual Representative. I voted against the increase of salary then; at all stages I voted sgainst the conference report, but it passed through the House on final vote by just one majority. I don't remember that anybody ever praised me, particalarly, for voting against that report, and I never heard anybody blaming John Sherman for voting for it.

Now, in 1873, the conditions were exactly the reverse. I was chairman of the committee that ind charge of the great appropriation bill. There was put upon that bill against my earnest protest a

that bill against my earnest protest a proposition to increase salaries. I take i there is no one here who will deny that there is no one here who will deny that I worked as earnestly as I could to prevent the putting of that increase upon the bill. I did not work against it because it was a theft or robbery to put it on there; I worked against it because I thought it was indecent, unbecoming, and in the highest degree unwise and injudicious to increase the salaries at that there. First because the ball the ball there is no the salaries at the sa

crease the salaries at that time. First, because they had been increased in 1856, and in proportion enough—paid more in proportion than most other officials were paid. Second the glory of the enough—paid more in proportion than most other officials were paid. Second, the glory of the Congress had been that it was bringing down the expenditures of the Government from the highest level of war to the lowest level of peace; and that it was bringing down the expenditures of the Government from the highest level of war to the lowest level of peace; and that it was to the lowest level of peace; and that it was to the lowest level of peace; and that it was to the lowest level of peace; and that it was to the lowest level of the second of the world seriously injure the Republican party, and on that score I thought we ought to resist it. Idid all in my power to prevent that provision being added to the bill. I voted against it eighten it was put upon the bill. I was captain of the ship, and this objectionable freight had been put upon my deck. I had tried to keep it off. What should I do? Burn the ship? Sink her? Or, having washed my hands of the responsibility for that part of the cargo I had tried to keep off, navigate her into port, and let those who had not this freight on be responsible for any large the ship of the ship of the responsibility for had put this freight to be responsible for any large the ship of the ship of the ship of the ship of the responsibility for that the ship? Sink her? Or, having washed my hands of the responsibility for that the ship? I would be succeed the ship of the ship? Sink her? Or, having washed my hands of the responsibility for that the ship? I would be succeed the ship of the

it we raised our own salaries, unless the rise had been made before, it would be a keynote on which the whole tune of extravagance would be sung. I believed too, that it would seriously injure the Republican party, and on that score I thought we ought to resist it. Idid all in my power to prevent that provision being added to the bill. I voted against it eighteen times. I spoke against it eighteen times. I spoke against it eighteen times. I spoke against it is purely large vote in the Renate, the salary clause was put upon the bill. I was captain of the ship, and this objectionable freight had been put upon my deck. I had tried to keep it off. What should I do? Burn the ship? Sink her? Or, having washed my hands of the responsibility for that part of the cargo I had tried to keep off, navigate her into port, and let those who had mut this freight on be responsible for it? Using that figure, that was the course I though the my hands of the responsible for it? Using that figure, that was the course I thought it my duty to adopt. Now on that matter I might have made an error of judgmant. I believed then and now shat if it had been in my power to kill this bill, and had thus brought on an extra work blamed man in the United States. Why? During the long months of the exera session that would have been the worst blamed man in the United States. Why? During the long months of the expenses, if I had not felt behind have felt by having its business disturbed by Congress, and the uncertainties of the exerations with nerve enough and force enough to carry his bill through by the propriations with nerve enough and force enough to carry his bill through by the have a Congress we had better see if we can be a man who will get his bills, and of the session. The next time we have a Congress we had better see if we have a Congress we had better see if we have a Congress we had better see if we have a Congress we had better see if we have a Congress we had better see if we have a Congress we had better see if we have a Congress where the state of the state of

whether to do what seemed to me right in the case, to put let the consequences be what they would. It is to their tates sugtioned the First so, but I did what I thought was the less bad of two courses. My consequent constitution, dit welve bill. and its own people, just as much as War-ren has been governed by its own corpo-rate laws and authority. I remember perfectly well what has been paraded in the papers so much of late that Congress has full power to legislate over the District of Columbia. Well, Congress in the papers were congressed as full power to legislate over of the District of Columbia. Well, Congress of the District of Columbia. Well, Congress of the District of Columbia and Congress could, I suppose, make all the police of regulations for the city of Washington; abut Congress always allowed the city of Washington to have their city council, or a legislature, antil the present time. We have abolished it, because we had a cumbrous machine. In the year 1871 a law was passed by Congress creating the board

bill.

I did not myself parade the fact, but more than a year ago the New York World published a list, stating in chronological order the Senators and Representatives who covered their back pay into the Treasury. My name was first on the tist. [Applause.]
I appeal to the sense of justice of this
people whether they will tolerate this sort
of political warfare. It has been proven again
and again that I never dress the back pay, never
saw a dollar of it, and took no action in refersaw a dollar of it, and took no action in referprocessed by Congress creating the board of public works, appointing a governor, and creating a legislature for the District of Columbia. That act stated what the board of public works could do and what the other branches of the District government could do; and among other things, it empowered the legislature to levy taxes to make improvements on the streats. The ence to it except to sign an over on the Sergeant-ence to it except to sign an order on the Sergeant-at Arms to cover it into the general Treasury, and this was done before the consention at War-ren. I say more. Some of these men who have been so long pursuing me have known these facts for many months. Durto make improvements on the streets. The legislature met the board of public works, laid before them an elaborate plan for iming the stormy times of salary excitement a citizen of this county wrote a letter to a prominent official in the treasury of the proving the streets of Washington, a plan amounting to six million dollars in the prominent omeas in the treasury of the United States wanting to know whether Mr. Garfield drew his pay or not, and received a very full and circumstantial reply stating the facts. That letter is in this town I suppose, to-day, but those who have had possession of it have been careful. have had possession of it have been careful never to show it. I have a copy of there, and if these men continue lying about it, I will print it one of these days. [Sensation and great applause. Ories of "Let us have that letter read now, General Garfield."] I will not give the name of the party. The name I have not to whom it is addressed.

is addressed.

[The audience here absolutely insisted on having the letter read, some demanding the name and all positively refusing to allow the speaker to proceed without reading the letter in justice to himself and for the information of the audience.]

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, "WASHINGTON, June 9, 1873. "Dran Sin: Your letter written early in May was forwarded to me at Youngstown, where it could not be answered for want of accurate data. When about to return to Washington I searched for that letter but could not find it. My recollection o its contents is that you inquired as to the repayment into the Treasury by General Garfield of the additional compensation due him as a member of the Forty-second Congress, under the provisions of the general appropriation act of March 3, 1873, "The additional compensation due Gen-eral Garfield was drawn by Mr. Ordway, Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Repre-

sentatives, and by him paid into the Treas ury as a miscellaneous revenue receip The money was drawn by Mr. Ordway or the order of General Garfield. The prac-The money was drawn by Mr. Ordway on the order of General Garfield. The practice of the Sergeant-at-Arms is to take receipts from members in blank in anticipation of the dates at which they are to become due, and to pay their check on him by drawing the money from the Treasury on those receipts. In this way he is in a measure the bankers of the members. General Garfield had signed such receipts month after month at the beginning of the month, one of which was filled up by Mr. Ordway and presented to the Treasury. At that time I believe General Garfield was out of the city, but I happened to know that as soon as the 22d day of March this written order was delivered to Mr. Ordway if he had not drawn any money from the Treasury on his account to close the account without drawing it, and if he had drawn it to return it. Mr. Ordway then informed him that it was necessary for him to sign a special order on the Treasury if he wished il drawn out and covered in, otherwise Mr. Garfield could draw it any time within two years; wherenpon Mr. Garfield drew an order for \$4.548, payable to the order of Mr. Ordway, to be by him covered into the Treasury. This was presented to the Treasury and the movey turned over from this account to the form the treasury. This was presented to the Treasury and the movey turned over from this account to the form the proportion account to the into the Treasury. This was presented to the Treasurer and the money turned ove

from the appropriation account to the general account, so that no portion of tever left the Treasury at all. It was simply a transfer from the appropriation account to the general funds of the Treasury.

Very respectfully,

"ROBERT W. TAYLOR." anything about it. This was two days b [Applause.] Question. What was the date of the ad-Question, relative to the courament of Congress?

General Garfleid, Congress adjourned on the 3d of March. tion. What was the date of your

arsons was marshal of the Su ourt at that time, and was just

there was any impropriety in his taking that case up and arguing it, merely because he was an appointee and under his direction, and the Chief Justice responded: "There was none in the world." He

fore the adjournment of Congress. Or that day Mr. Parsons came to me and said

to me be had an important case; he had

make a statement of it before the board

but I can't do it until after Congress ad-journs." Congress adjourned two days later; the papers were sent to me of patents, modeled specimens, and docu-

find the patent what it purports to be

but I can't do it until after

"I will do it if I, on examination

Question. What was the date of your letter?

General Garfield. The 22d day of March to lose his fee in it-was likely to lose it unless the work was completed; go at any rate. He asked me if I would

was the date of my letter.

A voice. Give us some of the Decolyer matter. argue the case for him; if I would exam ine into the merits of this pavement and General Garfield. We will take each General Garfield. We will take each particular thing at the proper time and place. A note is handed me which I will speak of in this connection. It is that "during the debate Mr. Garfield answered a question of Mr. Hibbard, of New Hampshire, who said, 'how_about this plunder? How much plunder will it take out of the Treasury?" And that Mr. Garfield's answer seemed to imply that he did not reshire, who said, 'how about this plunder'; How much plunder will it take out of the Treasury? And that Mr. Garfield's answere seemed to imply that he did not regard it as plunder.' I believe there has been as much said on that particular reply of mine in connection with this salary business as anything else that has been sadd. Now I have already answered that in the general remarks I have made this evening, namely, when a Democrat from New Hampshire rose in his place and put a question to me, inquiring how much money it would take out of the Treasury if this salary act passed, and put it in the from of saying how much "plunder" it would take, I did not at first notice he used the word "plunder," and I answered twould take, I did not at first notice he used the word "plunder," and I answered twould take, I did not at first notice he used the word "plunder," and I answered twould take, I did not at first notice he used the word "plunder," and I answered to meents showing where the pavement had been used were forwarded to me. The in-themical analysis representing all the chemical analysis representing all the chemical analysis representing all the remember of the pavement had been used were forwarded to me. The in-themical analysis representing all the chemical analysis representing all the remember of the pavement had been used were forwarded to me. The in-themical analysis representing all the chemical analysis representing all the chemical analysis representing all the remember of the pavement had been used were forwarded to me. The in-themical analysis representing all the chemical analysis representing all the chemical analysis. of the Treasury. Then Mr. Dawes rose and said, "Did my friend from Ohio notice

work. Mr. Parsons was to get a fee providing he was successful, and hence the sum work. Work was large-a contingent fee, as plunder. If any gentleman thinks that is taking more than is justly doe him in his consecience, let him call it plunder if he pleases."

Now, an attempt has been made to make tappear that Mr. Garfield approved the salary act because he answered this man that he didn't regard it as robbery. I answer now, I do not regard it as robbery. Now, one word more before I leave this guestion. I am glad the American people rose up in indignation against that salary direcases. There were some unkind and might that has been of very great service to the count on the prising, but they rose against it and reback of the proper seems of the indignation of the people in the profits, but they rose against it and reback of the profits of the profits

and its own people, just as much as War-ren has been governed by its own corpo-rate laws and authority. I remember people petitioned to have wooden pave-perfectly well what has been paraded ment. They preferred wooden pave-are the perfectly well what has been paraded ment. They preferred wooden pave-perfectly well what has been paraded ment. They preferred wooden pave-the perfectly well what has been paraded ment. petitioned to have wooden pave. They preferred wooden pave. It was cheaper than the asphaltum. American people generally believe in wood pavement; and the question was if these people want the these people want the wood pavement and are determined to have it, which pave-ment shall we give them, the best or not the best.

ment shall we give them, the best or not the best.

Now, I have before me here what I had when I made the argument, certificates from Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and all other cities where the pavement was made, that it stood better than any wood pavement that had ever been laid, and in the report of this cummittee of investigation in Washington a letter was received from the board of public works of Chicago, dated October 31, 1274, in these words: "Since 1869 there have been laid here in Chicago 160,000 square yards of the De Golyer pavement, and thus far it. the De Golyer pavement, and thus far it stands well and is in good condition." There is twice as much of that pavement in Chicago to-day as there is in Washingon. Now, I will tell you another fact about

proving the streets of Washington, a plan amounting to six million dollars in the first place, and the legislature adopted the plan and provided that one-third of the entire cost of carrying ost that plan should be raised by assessing the front foot on the property holders, and the other two-thirds should be paid by money to be borrowed by the city government; in other words by the issuing of their bonds. The city government of Washington borrowed money and raised by special taxation enough to carry on a vast system of improvement. When they got ready to execute their plan one of the questions that came before them was, what kind of pavement shall we put in, and in what way shall we go about the business of letting our paving contracts? In order to settle that question they wrote to all the principal cities and found out all the methods pursued by them and finally appointed four leading officers of the army—Gen. Humphreys, chief engineer; Gen. Meigs, quartermaster-general; the Surgeon-general and General Babcock of the engineer corps; and those four men sat as an advising board, having power but merely to advise. They took up all kinds of pavement ever made; specimens were eent in; they looked over the whole, and as a result recommended this: "We recommend you instead of letting this work be done by the lowest bidder, with all the scheming 'straw-bids' that may come in, to fix a tariff of prices you will pay for different kinds of pavement, and we recommend as follows: If you put down concrete paveton.

Now, I will tell you another fact about it. The testimony before this committee discloses the following: "That in the city of New York they paid \$5 50 to \$6 50 per square yard, in the city of Brooklyn they paid \$5 per square yard, and in the city of Baltimore, for putting down Nicholson pavement (which is not so expensive), they paid \$1 per square yard." Now all the De Golyer pavement put down in Washington was put down at \$3,50 per square yard under this tariff of prices fixed by the Board of Public Works upon the recommendation of the Board of Engineers. Well, now, fellow clitizens, who has raised this storm of criticism about the De Golyer pavement? Who? Early last winter several of us came to the conclusion that the Board of Public Works was an expensive machine; that it was costing the city of Washington too much; that it was overloading them with taxes, and that we were bound to pay too much money out of the Treasury to keep up our end of the business. But we set on foot an inquiry into the cause of the large expenditure, and a committee of investigation was appointed, and they have published some 1,000 pages of a report. They have gone over the whole ground of the doings of the Board of Public Works and the city government; and as a result of it we have abolished that form of government and had the President appoint commissioners, and he has appointed Govgovernment and had the President appoint proval. They have not always approved commissioners, and he has appointed Governor Dennison of our State as one of them, it acts. But they have sustained me beto manage the affairs of the District of cause they knew I was earnestly following Columbia until winter. That committee my convictions of duty, and because they kinds of pavement, and we recommend as follows: If you put down concrete pave-ment you had better say you will to manage the affairs of the District of d Columbia until winter. That committee of investigation went over the whole of ground of this business in Washington. It was a committee that had Senator Thurry and the season of the strongest stamp. The season of the strongest stamp of the modern of the strongest stamp of the season of the strongest stamp of the season of the strongest stamp of the strongest and ablest and the season of the season when the season when the season when he season of the sea ment you had better say you will pay so much per square yard for putting it down. We have looked the cities all over and find that it is the proper amount to pay; but for stone so much; for gravel so much; for asphaltum so much; and for wood so much." Now, that board of public works adopted the plan and that schedule of prices, and having elected if they put those various kinds of pavements down, they would put them down at that rate, they then said to all comers "bring in your various kinds of pavements and ahow us their merits, and when we have examined them we will act."

Then the various paving companies and show us their merits, and whom we have examined them we will act."

Then the various paving companies and a patentees all over the country who had twhat they called good pavements, presented themselves; but in almost all cases by their attorneys. They sent men there to represent the relative merits of the pavements. A pavement company in Chicago employed Mr. Parsons, of Cleveland, as early as the month of April, 1872, to go before the board of public works and present the merits of their pavements. Mr. Parsons had nottling whatever to do with the question of prices; they had already been settled in advance by the board. Mr. Parsons was marshal of the Supreme Court at that time, and was just about

nvestigation, and he wrote back the fol

proceeded with the case until the 8th day of June, when for the first time I heard "CONNERSYILLE, IND., August 1, 1874. Hon. George W. Steele: "Hon. George W. Steele:

"Dear Sir: To the request for information as to whether or not the action of General Garfield in connection with the affairs of the District of Columbia was the subject of condemnation by the committee that recently had those sifairs under consideration, I mancer that it was not; nor was there in my opinion, any evidence that would have warranted any unfavorable criticism upon his conduct. worked a good while on it but was called away. He must leave. He did not want

McClelland patent, and being called away from Washington about the time the hearing was to be had before the Board of Public Works on this subject, procured General Garfield to appear before the board in his stead and argue the merits of their patent. This he did, and this was the whole of his connection with the maile of his connection with the ma er. It was not a question as to the kin-of contract that should be made, but as t whether this particular pavement should the contract made in reference to it; and there was no evidence which would war-

with the latter.
'Very respectfully, &c.,
J. M. Wilson.

different wood pavements proposed, and to carefully and analytically examine all the relative merits of those was no small work. Mr. Parsons was to get a fee providing he was successful, and fot any if he was not successful, and hence the sum offered was large—a contingent fee, as Now, fellow-citizens, it is not pleasant for me to be reading things of that sort concerning myself, that the man who had charge of the investigation in the Distriet of Columbia, the man who wrote the report on the part of the House, who was the chairman of the committee, who knows all the facts in regard to it, says there was all the facts in regrid to it, says there was nothing whatever in the case that in the slightest degree reflected on me. It is left for the excessively virtnous judge of the probate court of Primesville, and perhaps the judge of the probate court of Trumbull county, to discover that this "De Golyer business" was a fearful business on the part of General Garfield. [Tremenders applause]

who has any question to ask in regard to the De Golyer pavement business I shall be glad to hear it.

Question. Was the appropriation for the payments for the pavements made before or after it was accepted by the board?

General Garfield. I am very glad to answer that question. By the first act of the Legislature of the District of Columbia, no contract was to be made, no work was to be done except upon appropriations already made. Congress had adjourned. The appropriation for the District of Columbia were made before I touched or had anything to do with this matter. It is true that the next year there were approlations made for the District of Columbia, made never had anything to say about one any payment or another. Congress knew no so more about the De Golyer pavement or any other pavement than you in Warren did. It simply made the appropriation to he pay for paving in front of its own buildfilt ingstif it thought proper to does, and that it general Garfield was free from all "guilty connection with that deneral Garfield was free from all "guilty connection with that with the meters of the Nineteenth district of Onio, in 1874, and again in 1876, and in 1878; and that in January, 1880, he was unanimously nominated by the Republican members of the Legislature of Ohio, for the Senate of the United States, to which he was chosen by their unanimously nominated by the Republican members of the Legislature of Ohio, for the Senate of the United States, to which he was chosen by their unanimously nominated by the Republican members of the Legislature of Ohio, for the Senate of the United States, to which he was chosen by their unanimously nominated by the Republican members of the Legislature of Ohio, for the Senate of the United States, to which he was chosen by the Republican members of the Legislature of Ohio, for the Senate of the United States, to which he was chosen by their manimously nominated by the Republican members of the Legislature of Ohio, or the Senate of the United States, to which he was chosen by t

was submitted to you in that case? They wanted wood pavement, and the it a question of law or a question of the difference between the pavements?

General Garfield. There were questions both of law and of merit. In the first

ned to have it, which pave- place there were forty-two different kinds of pavements presented. If the Government took one there might be a question of conflicting patents—there might be a patent lawsuit growing out of it, and I felt it to be my first duty to inquire whether the two patents that extend into this pave tion as the very first step I took in the case. I understand that the Board of Public Works said that they did not care very much about that, on the ground that they probably would not pay a royalty in any case; but the fact was that the contractor himself—the owner of the pa ent-regarded it as a valuable franchis and the validity of the patent was to him the first consideration.

Now, where there are forty patents or nearly that concerned, it is of some impornearly that con tance to know the relative validity of the

patents. Question. Would it have made any dif-Question. Would it have made any difference to the taxpayers of Washington, or to the Government treasury, whether Mr. Parsons received five thousand or twenty thousand dollars for his services?

General Garfield. Well, I suppose not. I never saw how it would.

If no further questions are to be asked I will conclude with a few general reflections on the whole subject.

Nothing is more distasteful to me than to speak of my own work—but this discussion has been made necessary by the persistent misrepresentations of those who assail me.

James assail me.

During my long public service the relation between the people of this district and myself has been one of mutual confidence and independence. I have tried to follow my ewn convictions of duty with a little regard to personal consequences, relying upon the intelligence and justice of ethe people for approval and support. I have sought to promote, not merely local and class interests, but the general good of the whole country, believing that thereby I could honor the position I hold and the district I represent. On the other hand my constituents have given me the great support of their strong and intelligent approval. They have not always approved my judgment, nor the wisdom of my public sets. my convictions of duty, and because they did not want a representative to be the mere echo of the public voice, but an in-telligent and independent judge of public

questions.
[Mr. Garfield then referred to some local movements and to the opposition of certain politicians, and concluded as fol-

lows:]
In conclusion, I appeal from these men
to the best men in the district—to men
who are in every way as worthy and every
way as capable as they are to judge my
conduct—nor do I hesitate to refer all inconduct—nor do I hesitate to refer all inquiries to those noble men with whom I have acted during my public life. They have worked with me as representatives during all these years and know the character and quality of my work. I have sought to make myself worthy of an honorable fame among them, and have not sought in vain. They have placed me in many positions of large trust and responsibility, and in the present Congress I again hold the Chairmanship of the committee of the Second if not the flist inportance in the House of Representatives. I fear-lessly appeal to the honorable members of the present Congress, and of all the Conhold up my hands and enat n their power to depreciate my work

veaken my support.

Mr. Wilkins. You are rising too fast;
hey are alraid of being eclipsed.

Mr. Garfield. In all this I have relied upon the good sense and justice of the people to understand both my motives and he motives and efforts of my enemies. On some questions of public po have been differences between some of my onstituents and myself. the currency question, I have followed what seemed to me to be the line of truth nd duty, and in that course I believe that the majority of the people of this district now concur. Whether right or wrong in now concur. Whether right or wrong in opinions of this sort, I believed it to be my duty to act independently and dance with the be est light

Fellow citizens, I believe I have done my country and you some service, and the only way I can still continue thus to ble degreeyour confidence am very grateful for the expression of confidence which you have again given me by be laid. The criticism of the committee
was not upon the parement in favor of
which General Garfield argued, but upon
the contract made in reference to it; and
there was no evidence which would watrant the conclusion that he had anyting to

time.

And now, in conclusion, if there is any question or anything I have discussed or that I have not discussed, which any gentleman desires to propound, I shall be very glad to hear it. [The speaker paused, but no questions being asked, closed his remarks as follows:] I thank the audience for the very patient attention with which they have honored me. [Applause.]

The Republican Congressional Committee, in re-printing this speech, which was delivered by General Garfield in the face of his constituents, when the charges were fresh and public sentiment was in the highest degree exacting, call attention to the fact that this speech was circulated in ous applause]
If there is any gentlemen in this hall large quantities throughout that district; If there is any gentieuses in regard to that General Garden who has any question to ask in regard to the De Golyer pavement business I shall Congress from the Nineteenth district of Ohio, in 1874, and again in 1876, and in 1874, and again in 1876, and in the congress of the congress of